



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

women and children who came to Virginia and about 2,000 servants and slaves.

It is not an agreeable task to have to criticise such a book as this, which, as has been said, is full of interest and of information. Especially may the chapter on education during the seventeenth century be commended as the best treatment of the subject which has appeared.

PAUL JONES, FOUNDER OF THE AMERICAN NAVY. A history. By Augustus C. Buell. In two volumes. Charles Scribner's Sons. New York, 1900. Pp. xv, 328; 373.

Great as are the merits of Mr. Buell's life of Paul Jones (and they have been generally recognized), it would have added much to the satisfaction of the student if he had been more explicit as to his authorities, especially those in manuscript. It may be satisfactory to the author to content himself by saying that Jones' papers were divided after his death, and to tell into whose hands they fell, but it is not altogether so to the reader. An author may cite, with verbal correctness, and yet a knowledge of the character of the sources of his information may greatly effect one's opinion of its value.

Paul Jones' life in Virginia, is, of course, a minor matter in his remarkable career, but we, here in Virginia, are interested in it, and wish to be exact as to details.

Mr. Buell states in the beginning of the life, that it was usual for ships making the voyage to and fro, between England and Virginia, to make a triangular trip, taking in the West Indies. In numerous letters of Virginia shippers which have been examined, there is nothing to confirm this. On the contrary, the writer has seen no reference to such a method of making the voyage.

Mr. Buell states that on John Paul's first voyage he dropped anchor in the Rappahannock river, "near the present site of the sleepy old Virginia village of Urbanna." Urbanna, by the way, was, for Virginia, quite an old village at the date of this voyage, 1759. But this is only worth noting because Mr. Buell states that the plantation of William Jones, who had adopted William, John Paul's brother, was only a short distance away, thus making it in the county of Middlesex. All other accounts have located the residence of this brother William in Spotsylvania county, which is at the head of navigation on the Rappahannock, and with the counties of Essex and Caroline, and part of Middlesex intervening between it and Urbanna.

Again we should be glad to know what and where is the "quaint old colonial record"—a will, which Mr. Buell mentions on pages 15 and 16. The terms, as given, are unlike the usual colonial will, and a man who owned 3,000 acres on the Rappahannock, a mansion house, mill, &c., thirty negroes, twenty horses and colts, and eighty cattle, was above the usual wealth, and his light could by no means have been hid under

a bushel. Can anyone produce any notice of a William Jones or William Paul Jones, from the Essex or Middlesex records, who owned any such estate as this? It would also be interesting to know whether Mr. Buell quotes the deed of trust to Frazier Brothers, of Port Royal, which John Paul Jones made in May, 1775, from the original record, or does he take Jones' statement, made at a later period, as to what the deed conveyed.

The Betty Parke (p. 18), for whom Jones is said to have shown a partiality, could not have been related to Martha Washington, or to her first husband, Mr. Custis, which is doubtless meant, for this family of Parke became extinct early in the eighteenth century.

The reason that doubt is raised by Mr. Buell's account of Paul Jones' life in Virginia, is that it is so different from that which has been ordinarily accepted as correct. When, in 1838, his niece, Janette Taylor, petitioned the State of Virginia for a grant of bounty land in consideration of her uncle's services (see this Magazine, VII, 286, &c.), she stated: "That their testator was a citizen of Virginia, and a resident of the Town of Fredericksburg." A letter from Judge Francis T. Brooke, of the Virginia Court of Appeals, a gentleman of the highest honor, and a native and life time resident near Fredericksburg, is filed with this claim. Judge Brooke says: "All I remember of John P. Jones, I had from my brother, Doctor Brooke, who was surgeon of the Bon Homme Richard the whole of her celebrated cruise. I think I remember when very young to have seen him in the year 1773. I was at school in Fred'g and his brother, William Paul, was a Scotch tailor who made my clothes. On his death, John came to Fred'g to adm. on his prop. * * * it is a mistake that his brother was a merchant." And a letter in the Richmond *Dispatch* from Fredericksburg, published in 1900, states that the Spotsylvania records show that in 1773 John Paul Jones administered on the estate of his brother, William, who died in that year. Quite a wide difference between being a planter of very considerable wealth for the time, and being a tailor in Fredericksburg. Almost as wide apart as a plantation near Urbanna, in Middlesex, and a store at the corner of Main and Market streets, Fredericksburg, which is still pointed out as having been the residence of John Paul Jones. What is the truth? The records are all extant and will tell it to whoever will take the time and trouble to investigate them.

Several other things may also be noticed. On pages 19-21, the author gives an account of a difficulty at Norfolk in December, 1774, between Paul Jones and an English naval officer, quoting a letter from Jones to Joseph Hewes, and states that the affair soon found its way into the colonial newspapers. This was a most likely thing for it to do, but curiously it never found its way into the Virginia newspapers (which it would be thought was the most probable place), for a careful examina-

tion of the *Virginia Gazette* in December, 1774, and January, 1775, shows no reference whatever to such an event.

Again Mr. Buell states that in May, 1775, two French frigates came into Hampton Roads, on one of which was the Duke of Chartres, soon afterwards High Admiral of France. According to the account here given the arrival of these frigates was so well known that Jones living on the Rappahannock heard of it and brought a sloop load of provisions as a gift to the Duke. Such a presence in Hampton Roads would have excited much interest in Virginia at any time, and particularly at this moment, and it would seem certain that the Virginia papers, which chronicle the arrival of every trading vessel, would have had full accounts of these important visitors. But, very strangely, a thorough examination of the *Virginia Gazette* from the middle of April to the middle of June, 1775, shows not the slightest mention of the French ships.

On page 58 a letter of Jones' is quoted, in which he states that from his agriculture, trade and milling in Virginia, he netted during 1773, 1774 and 1775, "nearly 4,000 guineas in the aggregate, over and above all necessary outlays." The man who made such a profit as this during the years named would have been one of the richest men in Virginia, and would then have been a colonial magnate, irrespective of any later fame. It is singular that Jones has never been heard of in this connection before.

Another letter, this time from Joseph Hewes, is quoted on pages 74-75, which gives an account of a sarcasm of John Paul Jones on John Adams' French. This *bon mot* was made in Philadelphia in 1775, in the presence, among others, of Miss Betty Faulkner, of Virginia, who had been educated in France. Genealogists of Virginia at the present day would be glad to have further information in regard to Miss Faulkner, of whom they have never before heard, and the students of the history of education in Virginia would also be grateful for more light on this (to them unique) case of a Virginia girl educated in France during the colonial period.

The statements in regard to Arthur Lee demand a much fuller and more careful investigation than can be made here. Charges were made, during the Revolution, effecting both his capacity and his honor, but, in the opinion of many of the foremost men of the time, John Adams among them, these charges were groundless. However bad tempered, incompetent or factious Lee may have been, it will take more than the charges of jealous colleagues or persons hostile to him, to bring conviction that he was unpatriotic or treacherous.

One reference to Lee and Adams is not easy to understand. On pages 126-127, he says in regard to Jones' draft which had been protested by the American Commissioners, and to the letter they wrote him: "This

letter was signed by Dr. Franklin, John Adams and Arthur Lee. It is easy to imagine the willingness of the two extremes of Massachusetts Puritan and Virginia Cavalier to sign such a letter as that, but the signature of Benjamin Franklin is not so easily understood." It seems to mean that it was easy for Massachusetts and Virginia to do what Mr. Buell thinks a very mean thing.

Speaking of Arthur Lee's secretaries who he claims were spies, he says one, Hezekiah Ford, was denounced as a spy and traitor by the Virginia Legislature, by resolution, January 6, 1779. Now it happens, as any one who will examine the journals will see, that the Virginia Legislature was not in session between December 19, 1778 and May, 1779. How then it could have adopted a resolution on January 6, 1779, is another of the puzzles of Mr. Buell's book.

If the author had made a little farther use of the research he is rather proud of he would have found that Stephen Sayre (p. 137) was not a native of England, but of Long Island, and was not deputy sheriff, but one of the sheriffs of London, and that he was a man whose devotion to the American cause was so strong that it led to his arrest in London on the charge of high treason.

It is difficult to conceive where Mr. Buell obtained his ludicrously incorrect account of "Chevalier Littlepage," better known to us here as Lewis Littlepage. He states (II, 201), that Littlepage was descended from an Irish soldier of fortune who emigrated to France early in the reign of William of Orange; that he was an hereditary knight of the Order of St. Louis, which Louis XIV had conferred upon his grandfather, and that Littlepage himself had made a voyage to America and spent two or three years in Virginia.

Not a word of this is correct. Lewis Littlepage was born in Hanover county, Va., December 19, 1762 (a fact stated on his tomb in Fredericksburg), was educated at the Grammar School of William and Mary College, and went to Europe in 1779 under the patronage of John Jay. He was the son of James Littlepage, of New Kent county, Va., and his wife Betty *Lewis* (hence Lewis L's. name), and was the great grandson of Richard Littlepage, who was living in Virginia in 1660.

To conclude with one more remark. During the course of the narrative Mr. Buell states that after the arrival of Jones in France, Arthur Lee wished him to return to America, Franklin wanted to keep him in Europe, and Deane was neutral, but on p. 155 Jones, in his letter to the King of France, states that his return to America was proposed by "the American plenipotentiaries," making no exceptions.

It is needless to say that there is no doubt of the accuracy of quotation by Mr. Buell from such authorities as he used. The trouble goes farther back—to the character of the authorities themselves.